REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Summary

Prior to entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-6 and 8, 9 and 11 were pending with Claims 1 and 6 being independent claims and the remaining claims being dependent claims. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, Claim 5 has been canceled without prejudice and Claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended without adding new matter. Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11 are pending with Claims 1, 6 and 11 being independent claims and the remaining claims being dependent claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11 in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 1 – 4, 6 and 8, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsueda (U.S. App. No. 2002/0186400) in view of Okada (U.S. Pat. 6,396,952).

In regard to Independent Claim 1, the Office Action has not provided a prior art reference or references that teach or suggest all of the features recited in the pending claim.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a printing apparatus that processes a print job and includes: "a responding unit configured to, in a case where the receiving unit receives the request and the determining unit determines that the print job specified in the request exists in the printing apparatus, transmit response information indicating that the request has been received to the information

processing system as a <u>response to the request received by the request</u>
<u>receiving unit before cancellation of the print job specified</u> in the request is
completed, and to, in a case wherein the receiving unit receives the request and
the determining unit determines that the print job specified in the request does
not exists in the printing apparatus, transmit error information to the information
processing system as a response to the request received by the request
receiving unit; and a transmitting unit configured to, in a case where the print job
has been canceled in accordance with the request received by the request
receiving unit, transmit event information indicating that the print job has been
canceled to the notification destination received by the receiving unit; a
transmitting unit configured to, in a case <u>where the print job has been canceled in</u>
<u>accordance with the request received</u> by the request receiving unit, transmit ~~the~~
<u>event</u> information indicating that the ~~received~~ print job has been canceled to the
notification destination received by the receiving unit" (emphasis added).

Thus, in the present invention, a printing apparatus receives a print job
and a notification destination of event information indicating an event relating to
the print job from an information processing system. Moreover, the printing
apparatus transmits two kinds of information with regard to job cancellation.

The first one is response information indicating that a request for
cancelling a print job (hereinafter called "cancel request") has been received.
The response information is transmitted to the information processing system as
a response to the cancel request. Such a structure enables the information
processing system to recognize, without awaiting a cancellation of the print job,

that the request has been received by the printing apparatus.

The second one is "event information" indicating that the print job specified in the cancel request has been canceled. The event information is transmitted to the notification destination as an event notification. Since the printing apparatus has already responded to the cancel request from the information processing system, it becomes necessary for the printing apparatus to notify the cancellation of the print job in a different way. Thus, the print apparatus makes use of the notification destination of the event information for notifying that the print job has been canceled.

Reviewing Matsueda, it describes a server 202 issuing a job cancel command to a printer 231 (S85, S92, or S108), receives a cancel command response from the printer 231 (S86, S93, or S109), and changes the status of the job to "being deleted" (S87, S94, or S1010). Then, the server receives a job deletion event from the printer 231 and changes the status of the job to "DELETE". However, nothing in Matsueda teaches or describes a printing apparatus which receives a print job and a notification destination of event information indicating an event relating to the print job from an information processing system where the printing apparatus transmits two kinds of information with regard to job cancellation a) response information indicating that a request for cancelling a print job and b) event information indicating that the print job specified in the cancel request has been canceled, as recited in Claim 1. Reviewing Okada, it describes a printing machine receiving print data from a requesting node (St 70), identifying a notification e-mail address in the print data

(St 71), and notifying the result of printing process of the print data to the notification e-mail address. The result of the printing process which the printing machine can notify includes PAPER JAM, COMMUNICATION ERROR, NO PAPER, NETWORK ABNORMAL, and QUEUED FOR PRINTING. Nothing in Okada teaches or a printing apparatus which receives a print job and a notification destination of event information indicating an event relating to the print job from an information processing system where the printing apparatus transmits two kinds of information with regard to job cancellation a) response information indicating that a request for cancelling a print job and b) event information indicating that the print job specified in the cancel request has been canceled, as recited in Claim 1.

Because Matsueda and Okada lack at least the above-noted features of Claim 1, Matsueda or Okada, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in Claim 1, and the Office Action has failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C § 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Independent Claims 6 and 11 are directed to a method and apparatus of canceling a print job and were rejected for essentially the same reasons as Claim 1. As such, the arguments set forth above with respect to Claim 1 are applicable to Claim 6 and 11. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 6 and 11 at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The remaining claims (Claims 2-4 and 8-9) are dependent claims and depend from one of allowable Claims 1 or 6. Therefore, the dependent claims are also believed allowable because they depend from an allowable base claim. Furthermore, each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, and individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct or credit any underpayments or overpayments submitted in conjunction with this response from/to deposit account number 502456.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the (949) 932-3104.

Respectfully submitted,

  02/24/2011   /Jonathan Ibasco/

Date   Jonathan Ibasco, Reg. No. 63,628
                                        Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731
Fax: (949) 932-3560